

Remarks

Claim rejections 35 USC § 103

In response to the Examiner's argument that features on which Applicants relied in their response of January 10, 2008 were not recited in the rejected claims, Claims 1, 13 and 23-27 have now been amended to clarify that the second section of code is sent to the client computer as a trickled stream of data which is encoded to be progressively and incrementally loaded by said web browser software and without requiring said client computer to open an additional communication port to listen for incoming event notifications.

Applicants therefore rely on the arguments submitted previously and reiterate their argument that Lok's event notifications, which are sent in discrete messages, do not form part of a stream of code as claimed.

The requirement that the second section of code is sent as a trickled stream of data which is encoded to be progressively and incrementally loaded by a web browser provides a clear distinction over the discrete, stand-alone messages sent by the MOM of Lok.

Dealing specifically with the new argument made by the Examiner regarding Fig. 29 of Lok, it is respectfully pointed out that Fig. 29 does not disclose an open-ended stream of code sent to the client computer.

Fig. 29 mentions two steps in the message flows occurring within the server (i.e. not involving the client computer at all) during the initiation of the CTI Adapter: The CTI server opens a stream connection and provides a stream handle to allow later message flows to be identified and captured by the event listener using this stream connection and stream handle. All of this occurs within the CTI server and is of no relevance to the claimed invention, which deals with the notification of events to a

client computer by employing an open ended stream of code sent across the network to a client computer for interpretation by a web browser.

As each of the independent claims has been amended in line with Claim 1, the same arguments apply to these independent claims and, by extension, to each of the dependent claims which includes at a minimum the same distinguishing features.

In view of the amendments and arguments made herein, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejections, and allow the application.

As this response is being filed during the fourth month following the Examiner's Office Action, an appropriate Petition for Extension of Time is submitted herewith. Finally, given the claims' changes and the fact that the Response would be refused entry as raising new issues after a final rejection, this Response is also being filed as part of a Request for Continued Examination in order to give the Examiner the appropriate latitude to consider the Response.

Further action is awaited.

September 23, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



William M. Lee, Jr.
Registration No. 26935
Barnes & Thornburg LLP
P.O. Box 2786
Chicago, Illinois 60690-2786
(312) 214-4800
(312) 759-5646 – Fax